

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-11 and 13-24 were pending in this application. By way of the present amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 14, 17, 19, and 22, and cancels claims 2, 5, 13, 18, and 21. Thus, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 14-17, 19, 20, and 22-24 remain under consideration. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Request for acknowledgement of Previously Submitted IDSs

As a preliminary matter, Applicant respectfully notes that no acknowledgement of the Information Disclosure Statements as filed February 13, 2002, July 23, 2002, and October 9, 2002, have been received. Applicant requests the examiner to acknowledge receipt and consideration of the information contained in those IDSs in the next action.

Rejection of Claims and Amendments

The Office Action repeats the previous grounds of rejection of claims 1-24 set forth in the prior Office Action. In that action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Scott et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,675,752, in view of Davis et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,969,716. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that the final action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to independent claims 1, 9 and 17, for the reasons set forth in Applicant's prior reply, which Applicant hereby incorporates by reference. In order to expedite allowance, however, Applicant has amended each of claims 1, 9 and 17 to incorporate the respective features of dependent claims 5, 13, and 21, as well as the dependent claims from which they depend.

As now amended, the independent claims each recite an scenario analyzing unit for analyzing the scenario memorized in the scenario rule memory to produce a “lacking data list,” which is exhibited or presented. In regard to these features, the Office Action refers to generally to Figures 5 and 6 (presumably of Davis), stating generally that “list of data lacks are suggested here.” In reference to Fig. 5, Davis indicates that “Fig. 5 is a block diagram of an exemplary template,” and more specifically, that “An example of one type of adaptive template which is created from the functional dependency network of FIG. 4 is shown in FIG. 5.” Fig. 6 of Davis illustrates “architecture of the system for building media templates.” It is not seen that Figs. 5 or 6 of Davis illustrates any unit that produces a lacking data list as recited in the claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the present rejection of the claims, or, alternatively, clarify the basis of the rejection so that Applicant may better understand the Examiner’s position.

With respect to dependent claims 6, 14 and 22 (which now depend respectively from claims 1, 9, and 17) the Examiner again refers generally to column 8, lines 35-55 and column 9, lines 10-65 of Davis. As previously noted by Applicant, the cited portions of Davis lack any reference to or suggestion of completion degree information as recited in the referenced claims. In the event that the Examiner maintains the rejection of these claims, Applicant again respectfully requests clarification of the specific aspect of Davis being relied upon and their alleged relation to Scott.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or

even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 5/10/04

By David A. Blumenthal ^{RN 38072}

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

DA
David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 26,257